

COMMISSIONERS APPROVAL

GRANDSTAFF *cg*

ROKOSCH *GR*

THOMPSON *at*

CHILCOTT *y*

DRISCOLL *rd*

PLETTENBERG (Clerk & Recorder)

Members Present.....Commissioner Carlotta Grandstaff,  
Commissioner Jim Rokosch, Commissioner Greg Chilcott and Commissioner Alan  
Thompson

Date.....August 28, 2008

Minutes: Beth Perkins

- ▶ Commissioner Driscoll attended a NACo Democratic Convention Reception in Denver, Colorado.
- ▶ The Board met for budget deliberations with Road Department; I.T.; Extension and Clerk of Court.
- ▶ The Board met for a Road Department update with Supervisor David Ohnstad.

Policy on access encroachment: David stated they revised the policy in 2007. The changes were two technical corrections in the change lane classifications and a \$125 fee. Another change is traffic impacts access with more details to the requirements. It is an attempt to make it clear for what is required.

Commissioner Chilcott questioned the orchard tract accesses. David replied any new access or change of use access would require a permit. The intent is to provide access to each individual tract. However, if a person has 100 tracts it does not mean they will have to get 100 access permits. Further discussion followed regarding accesses to tracts.

Commissioner Rokosch stated he sees a problem with 25% increased traffic being a threshold for a traffic impact analysis. He stated it needs to be revisited. David replied it was reviewed at some length with the subdivision regulations. Trying to come up with different thresholds for functional classification is problematic. Commissioner Rokosch agreed somewhat. He stated 25% for all classifications across the board is a concern. He can envision some subdivisions having an impact but being under the 25% mostly

between major and minor collectors. David stated whatever they come up with is arbitrary since there is no set standard. He stated he could look at other counties across the country for guidance. He stated he will talk to Renee Lemon and try to come up with a few thresholds.

Commissioner Rokosch stated another problem is authority for the policy and he has asked Civil Counsel for an opinion. He is not sure it can be adopted by motion rather than resolution. Board discussion followed regarding adoption by resolution.

**Commissioner Chilcott made a motion to adopt the amendments to the Access Encroachment Permits Policy. Commissioner Rokosch seconded the motion and all voted 'aye'.**

Bridge at Hawker Lane: David stated 1,011 cars per day are heading across the bridge. This is an opportune time to address the bridge. The options are to cut the head wall and extend it; insert a three-sided culvert; install a modular bridge similar to Kootenai but smaller; install precise footings; or drive piling on both sides of the bridge and cast in place a footing with a bridge over it. He recommends the last option and they propose to do it by contract. The cost estimate is \$117,032. They propose to take it out of the pro rata for Corvallis district. People on Hawker Lane would have to drive out on Woodside Cutoff. The closure should not last more than 3 to 4 weeks. **The Board agreed to allow David to issue an RFP for the project.**

Upper Woodchuck improvement petition: David stated paving it this year is not likely. The crushed aggregate for the base and the asphalt oil will be paid for by the homeowners if the Road Department will provide the labor. He stated the ADT is 81 trips.

Aldo Sardot stated the traffic study completed was 1,000 trips per week. The road is in bad condition. David stated there has been minimum road maintenance completed in the past. It is a county road. He is looking for Board approval to move forward.

Commissioner Grandstaff stated Missoula County residents use this road to access old subdivisions. She does not see the point of having the Road Department do work on a road that would only benefit Missoula residents. Commissioner Thompson disagreed. He stated he knows of hunting use and farming by the Mikesells. It has to be taken into consideration that it is used by Ravalli County residents. Commissioner Grandstaff stated the county should be spending funds on roads that are utilized more by Ravalli County residents. Commissioner Chilcott stated over a five year period, there has been some chip seal and minimal grading. The manpower is out there now.

David stated Eight Mile Road is not likely to be completed this year. Commissioner Rokosch asked what portion of county funds goes into the labor for the total cost of the project. David replied Martin Lane got in under the deadline the first year and it was 1.3 miles of constant issues with the surface condition. This estimate of materials, which may increase by next year would be around 50-50 for material and labor. Almost 60 to grade it and shape it. Commissioner Chilcott asked what would be the time commitment

to prep the road for dust abatement. David replied for water and to grade the road would be 26 hours. Commissioner Chilcott asked about prep and reshape for the road. David replied grade and shape and import gravel would be at least a week. Commissioner Chilcott discussed the timeline difference with dust abatement and chip seal and the benefits of doing the chip seal now. Further discussion followed regarding the chip seal.

Commissioner Rokosch asked David about the appropriate level of cost with the project. David replied John Cavot was the first person to agree to the project and within a week after the Board adopted the program, a petition was presented. There was some drainage issues involved. It was more than a percentage share. It is at a balance point right now. Commissioner Grandstaff stated she does not want to see funds being used on a road no one lives on. David stated the road does go beyond the county line but they do not have a permit to do maintenance beyond the county line. Commissioner Thompson stated if the Board turns down this road, does it mean if Rye Creek or North Kootenai comes in do we turn them down too? Commissioner Grandstaff stated she does not see why county funds should be used for the road when no one lives on it. Commissioner Rokosch stated he is concerned with the cost of Ravalli County paying 60% of the project.

Commissioner Chilcott asked Aldo if Missoula County was contacted. Aldo stated if Missoula County helped build the road they would want half of the pro rata funds. Commissioner Chilcott stated it would only be fair and right if both counties participate in the labor since it is a benefit to both. Aldo stated there was a meeting set up and it was cancelled. He understands that is the right way it should be done, but it is not happening. The people offered money to get it done and that money may not be available next year. There is an opportunity to do the road now. The majority of the residents use the road. It is not being done just for Missoula County.

Roger Mikesell stated it would help him as a resident of Ravalli County with his equipment. His property borders Upper Woodchuck. The maintenance could be done five to six times more and it wouldn't make much of a difference. It keeps the dust out of the hay. Commissioner Thompson asked if it is residences or subdivisions. Aldo replied there are about 12 residents from Missoula County that use Upper Woodchuck.

Commissioner Rokosch stated it is long overdue to visit with Missoula County for this road and the uses of pro rata with future growth. Commissioner Grandstaff stated the reason why the meeting was cancelled is that Missoula County was looking for a specific proposal and Ravalli County did not have one at the time. Commissioner Rokosch stated as for a road maintenance agreement, he asked David to draft a proposal. David replied what they have now has existed since 1940 which is a mutual operating agreement. Commissioner Rokosch asked for an update draft including Upper Woodchuck. David stated what is being looked at is something with the joint powers for Upper Woodchuck and public operation. He does not know if they really care what happens up there. They are still going to get the tax revenues. As for an operating agreement, he does not know if it would make a difference. Through joint powers, Ravalli County development standards could be applied to any subdivision application through their offices. He can try. Commissioner Chilcott stated the issue is whether or not to accept \$71,000 to make

improvements to this stretch of road. It is a matter of doing dust abatement a couple of times a year with maintenance or paving it.

Roger stated the road is going to last more than 5 to 7 years. Commissioner Grandstaff stated it is hard to justify spending the equivalent money (\$90,000) on a road that serves five people. Commissioner Chilcott stated the question is the comparison between chip sealing lasting 5 to 7 years and dust abatement and grading twice a year. It may be worth the chip sealing. Commissioner Grandstaff stated the Board is split on this road.

Michael Howell suggested calculating the road in Missoula County involved and have them take care of the road to the county line in turn for road on the west side. David stated that is pretty much what is in the operating agreement now. Commissioner Rokosch stated \$90,000 is the number being looked at out of the budget for this project. With the loss of \$215,000 to the Road Department's budget, \$70,000 from the residents is attractive. It is a tough choice. Further discussion followed regarding the budget for the Road Department. **No decision was made for the road.**

Functional classification amendment of Tammany Lane: David presented a traffic count to the Board. Its function as a traffic generator for collective road ways, it is clear the first part of Tammany Lane is not a minor local access road. The issue is where to look to distinguish between a local access and a collector road. Where they are looking is between Eastside Highway to the Stock Farm gate. David stated they would like to change the road classification from minor local access to minor collector.

**Commissioner Rokosch made a motion to change Tammany Lane from a minor local access agricultural road to a minor collector road by Resolution No 2279. Commissioner Chilcott seconded the motion and all voted 'aye'.**

Middle Bear Creek Road close with schedule/weight restriction: David stated they are currently stabilizing the road. The road should be re-opened by Wednesday afternoon. There was a discussion of a permit problem however, they are not working in the streambed but repairing an existing structure. Commissioner Rokosch asked about a weight restriction. David replied it is similar to Pleasant View and should be an 8 ton weight limit. **He requested a Resolution to place an 8 ton weight limit on the road. The Board concurred. The Resolution needs to be done by September 3<sup>rd</sup> prior to the opening of the road.**

Projects: Commissioner Grandstaff asked the status of Red Crow Road. David replied they are balancing out other projects and hope for some movement by next week or the week after for patching with a skid loader. He further discussed the problem with the roads are the classifications and the traffic counts for priority. There are limitations. After discussion, David stated they will go out and spend more time on the road.

Road Planning and investment: David stated he got together with Steve Powell and Howard Anderson in pursuing some options. The federal highway administration has different programs. In addition to those programs, a percentage of that funding is

reserved for certain projects for local governments on a merit basis. It allows local governments to compete for larger project funding. It would require legislative measures. It was a productive meeting and they expect to come up with some options.

Commissioner Grandstaff asked about Meridian Road. David replied they are re-grading it to form a base for the surface. Highway 93 by Sheafman Creek will produce more rotomillings for chip seal.

Commissioner Grandstaff asked about the problem with dust abatement. David replied the shipment was late therefore pushing back the applications. Next year there will be additional storage capacity for bigger shipments.

Commissioner Rokosch asked about 8 Mile Creek Road. David replied it is not done yet. The prep work is done and it has been stabilized with magnesium chloride. Patching has been done and the next step would be skin patches. He stated about mid-September to the end of September it should be completed.

Commissioner Chilcott discussed a citizen complaint with dust abatement. Commissioner Grandstaff stated if payment was accepted then abatement should be done. Commissioner Chilcott discussed the process by the staff. David agreed he will discuss the process with his staff to ensure everyone is on the same page.

► The Board met for a decision on the Growth Policy brochure. Present was Interim Planning Director Renee Lemon and Project Planner Jen De Groot.

Renee stated the Planning Department Staff created a growth policy brochure to give out at the fair booth. Commissioner Rokosch commented on the back panel white space opening. Commissioner Chilcott requested adding the MCA code 76-2-201 which states without the Growth Policy there can be no zoning. The Board concurred.

Commissioner Chilcott further discussed the use of the Growth Policy during subdivision review. Commissioner Rokosch suggested adding the basis for zoning and subdivision regulations as well.

**Commissioner Rokosch made a motion to approve the Growth Policy brochure with changes discussed today. Commissioner Chilcott seconded the motion and all voted 'aye'.**

Dan Cox stated he has a problem with the part regarding the citizens approving the Growth Policy and the statistics. He requested changing the numbers to reflect the qualified voters.

Jimmy Canton stated the Ravalli County Growth Policy is not a regulation. He asked if it is regulatory since without it you cannot have zoning. Commissioner Chilcott replied that is right but by definition it is not a regulatory document. Commissioner Rokosch pointed

out the language in the second panel. Jimmy further discussed any state departments administrating rules overrides MCA.

Dan Cox stated generally zoning must comply with the Growth Policy. It is not a regulatory document, however zoning must comply with the Growth Policy. Commissioner Chilcott replied MCA 76-2-201 covers the precursor. Dan asked if it must comply with the growth issue then what determines a zoning regulation. They are two separate issues.

Jen De Groot stated if you add certain things to the Growth Policy it could expedite subdivision review. Commissioner Chilcott stated Jen has a good point.

**Commissioner Rokosch amended his motion to include the insertion of the words “including the incorporated cities and towns” and on the third panel, clarification of code for growth policy and zoning regulations.** Commissioner Thompson stated he is not in favor of zoning but is in favor of the Growth Policy. At this time, you can’t have zoning without it. He does not like the fact citizens are trying to get rid of the Growth Policy because it is their only voice on zoning. He would like to see the Growth Policy stay in place and regulated by zoning. Yes, the Growth Policy allows zoning. There needs to be some common sense with this. **Commissioner Chilcott seconded the motion.**

**Discussion:** Dan Cox requested the voting numbers be removed from the brochure. He stated the sunset provision makes it mandatory. Jimmy Canton stated he would like to see language added to state without the Growth Policy there can’t be zoning. Commissioner Chilcott replied it is captured by MCA 76-2-201. **All voted ‘aye’.**

## Rural Minor Arterial System

The rural minor arterial road system, in conjunction with the rural principal arterial system, forms a network with the following service characteristics:

1. Linkage of cities, larger towns, and other traffic generators (such as major resort areas) that are capable of attracting travel over similarly long distances.
2. Integrated interstate and intercounty service.
3. Internal spacing consistent with population density, so that all developed areas of the state are within reasonable distances of arterial highways.
4. Corridor movements consistent with items (1) through (3) with trip lengths and travel densities greater than those predominantly served by rural collector or local systems.

Minor arterials therefore constitute routes, the design of which should be expected to provide for relatively high travel speeds and minimum interference to through movement.

## Rural Collector System

The rural collector routes generally serve travel of primarily intracounty rather than statewide importance and constitute those routes on which (regardless of traffic volume) predominant travel distances are shorter than on arterial routes. Consequently, more moderate speeds may be typical. To define rural collectors more clearly, this system is subclassified according to the following criteria:

- Major Collector Roads. These routes (1) serve county seats not on arterial routes, larger towns not directly served by the higher systems, and other traffic generators of equivalent intracounty importance, such as consolidated schools, shipping points, county parks, and important mining and agricultural areas; (2) link these places with nearby larger towns or cities, or with routes of higher classifications; and (3) serve the more important intracounty travel corridors.
- Minor Collector Roads. These routes should (1) be spaced at intervals consistent with population density to accumulate traffic from local roads and bring all developed areas within reasonable distances of collector roads; (2) provide service to the remaining smaller communities; and (3) link the locally important traffic generators with their rural hinterland.

## Rural Local Road System

The rural local road system, in comparison to collectors and arterial systems, primarily provides access to land adjacent to the collector network and serves travel over relatively short distances. The local road system constitutes all rural roads not classified as principal arterials, minor arterials, or collector roads.

# Heading1

Heading2

Heading3

Title1 : TAMMANY ln 500'w of ESH

Site: 6900

Title2 : MI-AA

Date: 10/16/06

Title3 : DirectionEB+WB

Interval	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Weekday	Week
Begin	10/16	10/17	10/18	10/19	10/20	10/21	10/22	Avg	Avg
12:AM	*	*	*	0	0	3	1	0	1
1:00	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0
2:00	*	*	*	1	2	0	0	1	0
3:00	*	*	*	27	21	1	2	24	12
4:00	*	*	*	40	32	5	4	36	20
5:00	*	*	*	94	76	17	8	85	48
6:00	*	*	*	99	106	31	8	102	61
7:00	*	*	79	93	103	47	20	91	68
8:00	*	*	114	110	82	54	38	102	79
9:00	*	*	106	102	95	69	57	101	85
10:00	*	*	100	104	114	61	41	106	84
11:00	*	*	100	89	87	61	48	92	77
12:PM	*	*	77	74	71	62	48	74	66
1:00	*	*	123	121	84	65	55	109	89
2:00	*	*	142	163	86	54	48	130	98
3:00	*	*	154	139	81	35	44	124	90
4:00	*	*	124	100	61	33	25	95	68
5:00	*	*	67	60	44	16	16	57	40
6:00	*	*	35	40	21	9	2	32	21
7:00	*	*	21	22	18	8	6	20	15
8:00	*	*	8	11	15	12	2	11	9
9:00	*	*	4	1	11	9	1	5	5
10:00	*	*	3	0	2	7	2	1	2
11:00	*	*	0	1	3	2	0	1	1
Totals	0	0	1,257	1,491	1,215	661	476	1,399	1,039
AM Peak	*	*	8:00	8:00	10:00	9:00	9:00	10:00	9:00
Volume	*	*	114	110	114	69	57	106	85
PM Peak	*	*	3:00	2:00	2:00	1:00	1:00	2:00	2:00
Volume	*	*	154	163	86	65	55	130	98



### Heading3

**Title3** : **DirectionEB+WB**

[illegible]

# Heading1

Heading2

Heading3

Title1 : TAMMANY ln 500'w of ESH

Site: 6900

Title2 : MI-AA

Date: 10/16/06

Title3 : DirectionEB+WB

Interval	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Weekday	Week
Begin	10/16	10/17	10/18	10/19	10/20	10/21	10/22	Avg	Avg
12:AM	*	*	*	0	0	3	1	0	1
1:00	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0
2:00	*	*	*	1	2	0	0	1	0
3:00	*	*	*	27	21	1	2	24	12
4:00	*	*	*	40	32	5	4	36	20
5:00	*	*	*	94	76	17	8	85	48
6:00	*	*	*	99	106	31	8	102	61
7:00	*	*	79	93	103	47	20	91	68
8:00	*	*	114	110	82	54	38	102	79
9:00	*	*	106	102	95	69	57	101	85
10:00	*	*	100	104	114	61	41	106	84
11:00	*	*	100	89	87	61	48	92	77
12:PM	*	*	77	74	71	62	48	74	66
1:00	*	*	123	121	84	65	55	109	89
2:00	*	*	142	163	86	54	48	130	98
3:00	*	*	154	139	81	35	44	124	90
4:00	*	*	124	100	61	33	25	95	68
5:00	*	*	67	60	44	16	16	57	40
6:00	*	*	35	40	21	9	2	32	21
7:00	*	*	21	22	18	8	6	20	15
8:00	*	*	8	11	15	12	2	11	9
9:00	*	*	4	1	11	9	1	5	5
10:00	*	*	3	0	2	7	2	1	2
11:00	*	*	0	1	3	2	0	1	1
Totals	0	0	1,257	1,491	1,215	661	476	1,399	1,039
AM Peak	*	*	8:00	8:00	10:00	9:00	9:00	10:00	9:00
Volume	*	*	114	110	114	69	57	106	85
PM Peak	*	*	3:00	2:00	2:00	1:00	1:00	2:00	2:00
Volume	*	*	154	163	86	65	55	130	98

### Heading3

Title3 : DirectionEB+WB

[illegible]